

REMARKS

The comments of the Examiner in his rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-15 have been given consideration by the Applicant and, in view of those comments, Applicant submits this amendment as placing the claims in condition for allowance and requests favorable consideration of the amended claims. Once again, no comment was  
5 made with respect to the drawings submitted with the application, so Applicant requests that the Examiner indicate their status.

Claims 1-2 and 4-8 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on Morris '723 and Holland '558. In the opinion of the Examiner, although the claims differ from Morris by specifying the inclusion of a "planar sheetform member", Holland discloses the use of  
10 planar sheetform members (reference numbers unspecified). Thus according to the Examiner, it would have been obvious to incorporate planar sheetform members into the system of Morris to increase the structural stability and maintain the shape of the device of Morris and additionally to obtain the benefits that Holland discloses. Also, the inclusion of a second handle would have been obvious in Morris.

15 Claim 1 as previously amended includes language "said flexible enclosure containing a planar sheetform member, said sheetform member being placed in the interior of said flexible enclosure directly adjacent said bottom surface"(of the flexible enclosure). Holland clearly teaches that the filtration media rests between opposing layers of coalescing material, with the lower of the opposing layers of coalescing material

then being positioned directly adjacent to either a structural stabilizing element or a fluid consolidation chamber. Due to the construction of Holland however, no flexible enclosure is disclosed, instead Holland teaches that the depth of the entire container is a plurality of layers of various types that permit the passage by drainage of a liquid  
5 downwardly through all the layers. Each of the layers of Holland extend to the sidewall of the container. Thus there is no teaching or suggestion in Holland to enclose each or any of the various layers of Holland within a flexible enclosure.

Furthermore, Morris does not teach or suggest any motivation to incorporate a planar sheetform member inside its flexible enclosure. Thus neither reference teaches or  
10 suggests any reason or motivation for the inclusion of a planar sheetform member inside the flexible enclosure directly adjacent the bottom surface of the flexible enclosure. Therefore, even if it is conceded that Holland discloses a planar sheetform member, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to locate it as claimed by Applicant. Further, given the explicit teachings of the two references, Applicant submits that it  
15 would not have been obvious to combine the features so combined by the Examiner at the time of the invention by Applicant.

With respect to the two handle limitation of claim 8, Morris at column 2, lines 46-  
56 only teaches the existence of one strap. Although the one strap is described as being attached to the bag of Morris in a number of ways, the reference contains no suggestion  
20 that there be more than one strap. Therefore, Applicant submits that based on the teaching of the reference, it would not have been obvious to disregard its teaching and

add an additional handle. Therefore Applicant submits that claims 1-2, and 4-8 should still be allowable.

With respect to claims 9-10 and 13, they have now been rejected under 103(a) based on Bamer and Schilling since Schilling arguably includes anchoring rods.

5 However, the supposed rods in Schilling are all horizontally oriented, and Applicant's claims recite that they are vertically oriented. Making Schilling's vertical would not permit them to retain the frame of Schilling, thus there is no reason to disregard the teaching of Schilling and make the rods project vertically in the manner of Applicant's invention.

10 Additionally, claim 9 recites that the anchoring rods extend upwardly from and are connected to the base of the coalescer chamber. Schilling does not disclose this limitation. In fact, instead of being connected to the bottom of the chamber, Schilling teaches that the "rod" are located near the top of the "chamber" so that the filter bag can hang therefrom. Thus even if it is obvious to include anchoring rods in Applicant's  
15 device, it would not have been obvious to orient them in the way disclosed by Applicant, and it would have not have been obvious to position them at the bottom of the chamber as claimed by Applicant. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 9-10 and 13 should still be allowable.

With respect to claims 12, 14 and 15 they have now been rejected under 103(a)  
20 based on Bamer and Schilling in view of Holland. However, the comments of the Examiner go on to apply Morris for reasons unclear to Applicant. In looking to

Applicant's claim language, claim 12 recites that the bottom surface of the flexible enclosure is directly adjacent the coalescer chamber frame base. This structural limitation is untrue with respect to Morris as can readily be appreciated from the drawing figures of Morris.

5           Claim 12 includes language "said flexible enclosure containing a planar sheetform member, said sheetform member being placed in the interior of said flexible enclosure directly adjacent said bottom surface"(of the flexible enclosure). Holland clearly teaches that the filtration media rests between opposing layers of coalescing material, with the lower of the opposing layers of coalescing material then being positioned directly  
10   adjacent to either a structural stabilizing element or a fluid consolidation chamber. Due to the construction of Holland however, no flexible enclosure is disclosed, instead Holland teaches that the depth of the entire container is a plurality of layers of various types that permit the passage by drainage of a liquid downwardly through all the layers. Each of the layers of Holland extend to the sidewall of the container. Thus there is no  
15   teaching or suggestion in Holland to enclose each or any of the various layers of Holland within a flexible enclosure.

          Also with respect to claim 12, the flexible enclosure has a planar sheetform member directly adjacent the bottom of the chamber. This limitation is not true with respect to Holland which shows a fluid consolidation chamber directly adjacent the  
20   bottom of the chamber. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art, if they found Holland's planar sheetform members worth combining with the other references would

KLW 001 P2  
Ser. No. 10/655,715

result in a container having a plurality of sheetform members and with a fluid consolidation chamber directly adjacent the bottom of the chamber, which cannot be the case with Applicant's claimed device.

In view of the amendments of the claims, and the foregoing remarks, claims 1-2,  
5 4-10, and 12-15 are submitted for further consideration as being patentable. The allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions which would expedite issuance of a Notice of Allowance, a telephone call to the undersigned is requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 13-3393 for any insufficient fees under 37 CFR §§ 1.16 or 1.17, or credit any  
10 overpayment of fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Kremblas, Foster Phillips & Pollick

By 

Patrick P. Phillips Registration No. 29,690

7632 Slate Ridge Blvd.  
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068  
(614) 575-2100  
(614) 575-2149 FAX  
[pPhillips@ohiopatent.com](mailto:pPhillips@ohiopatent.com)

July 5, 2006